

ESSENTIALS OF DASAPRAKARANA

Prasthanatrayi viz., Upanisads, Brahmasutras and Bhagavadgita are the main source of Vedanta Philosophy. Sri Madhvacharya has naturally written the Bhasyas on these three. In addition he has written one more work on Gita Viz. Gitatattvaprakaraṇa and three more works on Brahmasutras Viz., Anubhasya, Anuvyakhyana and Nyayavivarana. In addition to the Bhasyas on Upanisads, he has also written a Bhasya on the forty hymns of Rigveda. Thus, Sri Madhvacharya has given an exhaustive exposition of Prasthanatrayi.

The doctrines presented in the Prasthanatrayi are further elaborated in two types of works Viz., Vadagranthas and Prakaranagranthas. The vadagranthas raise long debates on the philosophical issues to examine the views of the other Schools of Vedanta and the other systems of Philosophy. Anuvyakhyana itself is such a vadagrantha. The commentators Sri Jayatirtha, and Sri Vyasatirtha have further enriched the vadagrantha literature of Dvaita Vedanta. The Prakaranagranthas are small treatises on specific issues of philosophy.

Sri Madhvacharya has written ten such Prakarana works which are collectively known as Dasaprakaranas. These are neatly planned. Two of them viz., Pramana lakṣaṇa and Kathalakṣaṇa deal with the epistemology and the Art of the Philosophical debate. Three treatises known as Khandanatraya examine the Advaita concepts of Mithyatva and Upadhi. Four treatises viz.,

Tatvasamkhyana, Tatvaviveka, Tatvodyota and Tatvanirnaya give an exposition of the central doctrine visnusarvottamatva and the other doctrines like the reality of the world, the five cordinal differences i.e., Panchabheda, the nature of the Jiva, the nature of the liberation etc. In the course of the presentation of these doctrines, the import of the important Sruti passages is discussed. The interpretations offered by the other Schools of Vedanta are reviewed Karmanirnaya the tenth Prakarana is a unique work. In this work by interpreting the Mahanamni hymns and by pointing out that Indra etc, all the names convey the Supreme God Visnu only, the philosophical import of even the Karmakanda portion of the Vedas is brought out. In this way these ten Prakarana works assist the comprehension of the doctrines of Vedanta enshrined in the Prasthan trayi and elaborated in the Bhasyas. A brief account of the contents of the ten Prakaranas is given below.

1. TATVASAMKHYANA 2. TATVAVIVEKA.

In Tatvasamkhyana as the very name suggests the categories of the reality as conceived in Dvaita Vedanta are enumerated. This small text opens with the definition of a Tatva i.e., a real entity: 'That which is not superimposed is a real entity'. It is further explained as that which is the object of valid knowledge. For instance, when 'A garland of flowers is comprehended as 'A garland of flowers' then its object viz., the garland of flowers is a real entity. But when some one mistakes it as a snake from a distance or in a dark place, his comprehension is not valid knowledge. Consequently its object viz., Snake which is

१. स्वतन्त्रं परतन्त्रं च द्विविधं तत्त्वमिष्यते ।

स्वतन्त्रो भगवान् विष्णुः (त.सं.)

२. तत्त्वमनारोपितम् । प्रमितिविषय इति यावत् । (त.सं.टी.)

superimposed on a flower garland is not a real entity. It is Aropita i.e., superimposed, and hence it is not a Tatva i.e., a real entity. All those that satisfy this definition i.e., 'Tatvam Anaropitam' are Tatvas.

The Tatvas are first classified into two Svatantra i.e., independent and Paratantra i.e., dependent. The Supreme god alone is Svatantra i.e., independent category. All other categories are Paratantra. The Svatantra is defined as that which is independent in respect of its very essential nature, the functions, and the comprehension. The Supreme God is only independent in all these respects. All others are entirely dependent upon the Supreme God in all these respects. Therefore, all others are Paratantra i.e., Paramatmatantra.

The Paratantra is further classified as Bhava and Abhava i.e., the Positive and the Negative. 'That which presents itself as 'Is' in its first cognition is Positive' and 'that which present itself as 'Is not' in its first cognition is 'Negative'. The Bhava i.e., the Positive is classified into Chetana and Achetana i.e., sentient and non-sentient. The sentient is further classified as that which is never afflicted by the sorrow and those that are afflicted by the sorrow. Goddess Lakshmi only is never afflicted by the sorrow. She is nityamukta i.e., ever free from the bondage. All other sentient beings are afflicted by the sorrow sometime or the other. Further classification of these is given in the Text.

३. स्वरूपप्रमितिप्रवृत्तिलक्षणसत्तात्रैविध्ये

परानपेक्षं स्वतन्त्रम् । परापेक्षमस्वतन्त्रम् । (त.सं.टी.)

४. प्राक् प्रध्वंसं सदात्वेन त्रिविधोऽभाव इष्यते । (त.सं.)

५. नित्याः वेदाः । वेदाः इत्युपलक्षणम् ।

पञ्चाशद् वर्णानाम् अव्याकृताकाशस्य च तथात्वात् (त.सं.टी.)

६. पुराणाद्याः कालः प्रकृतिरेव च नित्यानित्यम् । (त.सं.)

The non-sentient are classified into Nitya i.e., eternal and Anitya i.e., perishable, Nityanitya i.e., partly eternal and partly modified. Veda, Varna and Avyakṛta Akasa are eternal. Purana, Kala and Prakṛti are partly eternal and partly changing.

The negative i.e., Abhava is classified into three viz., Pragabhava i.e., previous negation, Pradhvanasabhava i.e., later negation and Sadabhava i.e., total negation. In respect of Abhava two important points have to be noted. (1) Anyonyabhava is not accepted as a category of Abhava. This is because, anyonyabhava i.e., Bheda, the distinction is considered as Dharmisvarupa i.e., an internal attribute of every entity. To be distinct from all other entities is the very nature of each entity, Therefore, this fact of being distinct from all other entities is part and parcel of the very nature of each entity. Therefore, it is not negative and hence is not to be considered as a category of Abhava. (2) The Sadabhava concept of Dvaita is distinct from the Sansargabhava or Atyantabhava concept of Nyaya Vaisesikas. The Sansargabhava of Nyayavaisesika can be easily included under Pragabhava, the absence before the Sansarga i.e., the contact, and under Pradhvansabhava after the contact is withdrawn, that is to say before the Jar is brought on the ground, it is Sansarga pragabhava and after the Jar is withdrawn from the

७. सृष्टिः स्थितिः संवृतिश्च नियमोऽज्ञानबोधने ।
 बन्धो मोक्षः सुखं दुःखमावृतिर्ज्योतिरेव ।
 विष्णुनास्य समस्तस्य समासव्यासयोगतः ॥ (त.सं.)
 आवृतिर्ज्योतिषी बाह्यतमःप्रकाशौ (त.सं.टी.)
८. भावाभावस्वरूपत्वात् नान्योन्याभावता पृथक् (त.वि.)
९. नित्यानित्यत्वभेदेन देशः कालः श्रुतिस्तथा ।
 भूतेन्द्रियप्राणगुणसूक्ष्मरूपं च नित्यकम् ।
 एषां विकारोऽनित्यः स्यात् (त.वि.)

ground it is Sansargapradhvansabhava. Therefore, there is no need to accept a separate type of Abhava called sansargabhava. In respect of the concept of Atyantabhava an important difference between the Nyaya concept and the Dvaita Concept is, the Pratiyogin of this Abhava is elsewhere present according to Nyaya view while according to the Dvaita it is only envisaged and denied. It is not a reference to that which is actually present elsewhere and its denial. Therefore, the Pratiyogin of this Abhava is apramanika i.e., not really existing elsewhere. This Abhava is an abhava i.e., absence present at all three times i.e., past, present and future. That is why it is called Sadabhava.

Tatvaviveka also enumerates the categories more or less in the same way. This work contains the verses of a larger work of the same name composed by the God himself. Thirteen verses are quoted in this small work in support of the statements made in Tatvasamkhyana. Therefore, it is not a repetition but an extract of a source work to support Tatvasamkhyana. Naturally the two texts verbatim agree barring a few passages. The few verses that are differently worded of additional contain some significant points. There are as follows.

- 1) The achetana i.e., non-sentient is classified into two viz., Nitya and Anitya i.e., eternal and non-eternal. The third group i.e., Nityanitya is not mentioned. This does not involve any conflict between the statement of Tatvasamkhyana and Tatvaviveka. The items listed under Nityanitya have an eternal aspect and a modified aspect. From the first aspect point of view these are included under Nitya, the second aspect naturally goes

१०. गुणक्रियाजातिपूर्वाः धर्माः सर्वेऽपि वस्तुनः ।
 रूपमेव द्विधं तच्च यावद्वस्तु च खण्डितम् ।
 खण्डिते भेद ऐक्यं च यावद्वस्तु न भेदवत् । (त.वि.)

under Anitya. In order to bring out these two aspects more clearly these are first listed under Nitya i.e., eternal, then, it is stated that the modified forms of these are anitya. Some more items in addition to the items listed under Nitya and Nityanitya in Tatvasamkhyana are mentioned. The nature of the modification in respect of these items differs from item to item. This is explained in the commentaries.

- 2) In Tatvasamkhyana Guna, Kriya, Jati etc, attributes are not mentioned. Here these are mentioned. These are classified into two groups viz., i) Yavad-dravyabhavi. i.e., The attributes that last as long as the substance lasts. ii) Ayavad-dravyabhavi i.e., the attributes that perish even before. The relation between the substance and the attributes, in the former case is abheda while it is bedabheda in the case of the latter.

In Tatvasamkhyana the attributes are not separately mentioned keeping in view the fact that the attributes are not totally different from the substance. Here, these are mentioned to bring out the nature and the relation of the two types of the attributes.

Strictly speaking these two texts form one unit. Therefore, these additional statements do not indicate any difference of views on the respective issues.

The Classification of the categories in these two texts is quite different from the pattern followed in the texts of the other systems

-
११. खण्डितं रूपमेवात्र विकारोऽपि विकारिणः ।
कार्यकारणयोश्चैव तथैव गुणतद्वतोः ।
क्रियाक्रियावतोस्तद्वत् तथा जातिविशेषयोः ।
विशिष्टशुद्धयोश्चैव तथैवांशांशिनोरपि ॥ (त.वि.)

of Philosophy such as Nyayavaisesikas. The Nyayavaisesikas go by the pattern as Dravya, Guna etc. This is because, the objective of those systems is to provide the knowledge of the material world, while that of Dvaita Vedanta is to lead to the knowledge of the Supreme God. Therefore, the Supreme God is first stated as Svatantra bringing out his Supremacy and all other categories are brought under Paratantra indicating their dependence on the Supreme God. The other categories are to be known only to realise the supremacy and the glory of the God. The concluding verses of these two texts make this position abundantly clear. The last verse of Tatvasamkhyana enumerates the creation, sustainance, destruction etc, eight states of the world that are caused by the God and glorifies Him by giving his Srityadi astakarttva definition. The concluding verse of Tatvaviveka emphatically states that it is the knowledge that the entire world consisting of Chetana and Achetana entirely depends upon the God that enables one to attain the liberation.

KHANDANATRAYA

Khandanatraya is a bunch of three treatises that critically review the Advaita Concepts of Upadhi, Mithyatva and reject the mayavada to be the purport of the Sastra.

-
१२. य एतत् परतन्त्रं तु सर्वमेव हरेः सदा ।
वशमित्येव जानाति संसारान्मुच्यते हि सः ॥
१३. विमतमनारम्भणीयमन्यथाप्रतिपादकत्वात् । (मा.खं.)
१४. न हि ब्रह्मात्मैक्यस्य याथार्थ्यं तत्पक्षे ।
अ) स्वरूपातिरेके अद्वैतहानेः ।
आ) अनतिरेके स्वप्रकाशत्वादात्मनः सिद्धसाधनता । (मा.सं.)

3) MAYAVADA KHANDANA

As the very title of this text suggests, this work points out that Mayavada i.e., Jivabrahmaikyavada is not the purport of the Sruti. If this is taken as the purport of the Sruti the study of the Sruti itself becomes a purposeless pursuit. It goes without saying that the Advaita Sastra is a purposeless pursuit as its objective and the subject cannot be convincingly and logically explained. These two points are presented in a syllogistic form as 'Vimatamanar-ambhaniyam` - anyathapratipadakatvat`. In this Syllogism Vimata i.e., The issue under the debate is to be taken as 'Vedadi Sastra` once, and as 'Advaita Sastra` once again. Anarambhaniya means not worth pursuing. The reason given in the syllogism viz., 'anyathapratipadakatvat` means that "it results in presenting something that is not true."

The points made in this syllogism are two: i) Veda etc, sacred literature shall not be worth pursuing if its purport is taken as Brahmatmaikya, since this results in their presenting something that is not true. ii) Advaitasastra is not worth pursuing as it states something that is not true.

These points are elaborated throughout this text. This may briefly be put as under:

- 1) If the so called Brahmatmaikya is true and different from Brahman, then, the very concept of Advaita will be defeated. Because, now there are two real entities viz., i) Brahman ii) Brahmatmaikya.
- 2) If the so called brahmatmaikya is true but not different from Brahman, then, Brahman being self revealing, the Aikya must

also be self-revealing. This means that no Sastra is required to teach it as it is already known.

- 3) It cannot be stated that 'the Ajnana i.e., Niscience has veiled Brahman. This prevents Brahmatmaikyajnana. Therefore, there is the need of the Sastra to teach it.` Ajnana cannot veil the very Brahman as it is self revealing. It cannot veil any characteristic or feature of Brahman such as Atmaikya since Brahman is nirvisesa i.e., he has no feature or characteristic.
- 4) According to Advaitajnana that reveals something which is already not known is Pramana. Since the Brahman is self-revealing and hence already known the Sastra that proposes to teach it is Apramana.
- 5) Further, Since Ajnana cannot veil Brahman, there is no subject matter for the sastra to be taught. According to Advaita the liberation is of the nature of removal of Ajnana. As there is no Ajnana, there is no need of any removal of it. Thus, there is no Prayojana i.e., the purpose to be served by the Sastra. As there is no Ajnana there is no Adhikarin i.e., eligible person to study the sastra. This means there is no Anubandhachaturstaya viz., the subject, the objective, the eligible person and the relevance of all these. Hence the Advaita Sastra is not worth pursuing.
- 6) In case Brahmatmaikya is Mithya i.e., not true, then, the Sastra that teaches it shall not be pramana.

In this way the Untenability of Advaita i.e., Brahmatmaikya to be the Subject matter of Vedadi Sastra is established. The purposelessness of Advaita -sastra is also established.

Then, it is declared that Visnusarvottamatva is the purport of

१५. सिद्धत्वात् स्वरूपस्य विशेषाभावाच्च न अज्ञानं कस्यचिदावरकम् ।
(मा.खं.)

१६. मिथ्यात्वे च ऐक्यस्य अतत्त्वावेदकत्वमागमस्य स्यात् (मा.खं.)

the Vedadi Sastra. This is demonstrated by quoting the verses 'Dvau Imau Purusau` etc, from Bhagavadgita and 'Indriyebhyah para hi arthah` etc from Kathopanishat.

The two aspects of the theme of this text are very well brought out in the Mangala verse of this text. The first line mentions the untenability of Advaita and the second line states the Visnusarvottamatva doctrine.

4) UPADHIKHANDANA

In mayavadakhandana it is already pointed out that the concept of Ajnana envisaged in Advaita is not tenable. In Upadhiikhandana it will be pointed out that Ajnana cannot play the role of Upadhi i.e., as an adjunct to project Brahman as Jiva. In Advaita, Ajnana is a key concept. The projection of the Jiva and the Jagat is attributed to it. It is the cause of the bondage and its removal is liberation. Therefore, it is necessary to examine its nature and the role to refute Advaita. Therefore, an examination of its role is made in this text., The points made here are briefly stated below:

1) There cannot be any Ajnana to veil Brahman who is omnisciant. He can neither be the locus of Ajnana nor the object of Ajnana.

2) It cannot also be stated that the Jiva is the locus of Ajnana. Though the Jiva is not distinct from the Brahman in the ultimate

analysis, he is projected as distinct by means of Upadhi i.e., adjunct and hence he can be the locus of Ajnana.

To answer this the following question may be raised whether the so called adjunct is a real adjunct or this is also projected by Ajnana.

- If it is real, then, there will be two reals: Brahman and Upadhi. This will defeat the very concept of Advaita.
- If the Upadhi is projected by Ajnana, then there will be infinit regress i.e., Anavastha. This is as follows: To project the Jiva as distinct, Upadhi i.e., Ajnana is required, to protect that Ajnana, one more Ajnana is required and so on. Further, there will be reciprocal dependence i.e., Anyonyasraya also. The projection of Upadhi depends upon the projection of Ajnana and the projection of Ajnana depends upon the projection of Upadhi. It will also lead to the circular dependence i.e., Chakraka as follows: The location of Ajnana on the Jiva depends upon the distinction of the Jiva, the distinction of the Jiva depends upon the projection of Upadhi and the projection of Upadhi depends upon Ajnana.

The above points are made against those advaitins who consider the Ajnana as Mithya i.e., Projected.

१७. एवमेव प्रयोजनमपि निरस्तम् ।

स्वरूपत्वात् मोक्षस्य पूर्वमेव सिद्धत्वात् ।

विषयप्रयोजनाभावादेव अधिकारी च ।

तदभावादेव सम्बन्धोऽपि (मा.खं.)

१८. विष्णोः सर्वोत्तमत्वमेव सर्वशास्त्रार्थ-

त्वेन भगवता श्रुत्या च अभिहितम् ।

१९. अज्ञताखिलसंबन्धेर्घटते न कुतश्चन ।

उपाधिभेदात् घटत इति चेत् स स्वभावतः ।

अज्ञानतो वा (उ.खं.)

२०. द्वैतस्य सत्यता स्वत एव चेत् (उ.खं.)

२१. अनवस्थितिरज्ञानहेतौ वाऽन्योन्यसिद्धता ।

चक्रकापत्तिः (उ.खं.)

3) The concept of the Upadhi of such advaitins who consider both the Upadhi i.e., the adjunct, and the bheda i.e., the distinction are real, is criticised as under:

- a) The contention that a real distinction between Brahman and Jivas is caused by a set of real Upadhi such as Anthhkarana etc., is not tenable. Upadhis do not cause any distinction but only indicate the distinctions that are already there. In the instance of Akasa also the Upadhis such as Ghata, Matha etc., only indicate the particular places.
- b) If it is insisted that the Upadhi does not merely indicate the distinction but actually causes it, then, does it cause the distinction by contacting the whole of the object to be differentiated or a part of it? If the whole, then it is unable to differentiate, if by contacting a part, then to carve out that part another Upadhi will be required. This leads to the Infinit regress i.e., Anavastha.
- c) In the case of the difference between the Brahman and the Jiva, and among the Jivas, if it is not real, then, all will have to share the pains and the pleasures of all. It is the experience of all that they do not share the pleasures and the pains of all. From this it can be easily inferred that all are really different from each other.

२२. भेदश्चोपाधितः कुतः ।

विद्यमानस्य भेदस्य ज्ञापको नैव कारकः ।

उपाधिः दृष्टपूर्वो हि (उ.खं.)

२३. उपाधिसम्बन्धः एकदेशेऽथ सर्वगः ।

एकदेशेऽनवस्था स्यात् सर्वगश्चेत् न भेदकः ॥ (उ.खं.)

२४. अज्ञता चाल्पशक्तित्वं दुःखित्वं स्वल्पकर्तृता ।

सर्वज्ञत्वादीशगुणविरुद्धा हि अनुभूतिगाः ॥

After pointing out the untenability of the concept of Upadhi and the differentiation by it, a clear difference between the Brahman and the Jivas is brought out by mentioning the contrasting characteristics of the two. The Jiva's characteristics are: Ignorance, limited capacity, suffering and the limited agency. These definitely indicate that he is different from the God whose has unlimited knowledge, power etc.

Advaitin's plea that 'the very inability to explain the nature and the role of Ajnana is a merit' is ridiculed.

5) PRAPANCHAMITHYATVANUMANA KHANDANA:

In this text the stock syllogism that is put up in Advaita standard texts for establishing the concept of Mithyatva i.e., illusory nature of the world, is reviewed. The Syllogism reads as 'Vimatam Mithya Drisyatvat' This claim is illustrated by Suktirajata mentioning it 'yatha sampratipannam'. One who mistakes a shell to be the silver, the silver seen by him is not actually present. It is not sat i.e., true, because, it is not actually present. It is not a 'Asat' i.e., it is not totally untrue, because, it is seen. This status of something which is neither 'real' nor 'unreal' is designated Mithya in Advaita. On the analogy of 'Suktirajata' i.e., shell silver, they consider the above Syllogism is proposed by them. This syllogism is critically reviewed in this text.

To point out that a syllogism is defective certain fallacies with reference to the Paksa, Sadhya and Hetu are pointed out in a

२५. सार्वज्ञादिगुणाः विष्णोः श्रुतिषु प्रतिपादिताः । (उ.खं.)

२६. विमतं मिथ्या दृश्यत्वात् इत्युक्ते जगतः

अभावात् आश्रयासिद्धः पक्षः ।

अनिर्वचनीयासिद्धेः अप्रसिद्धविशेषणः । (प्र.मि.खं.)

philosophical debate. Hetu is argument, Sadhya is the point to be proved, Paksa is that with reference to which the point at issue is to be proved, Paksa is that with reference to which the point at issue is to be proved. For instance, when the presence of the fire on the hill is to be proved by observing the smoke the presence of the smoke on the hill is Hetu i.e., Argument, the presence of the fire on the hill is sadhya i.e., the point to be proved. Parvata i.e., the hill is Paksa i.e., that with reference to which the point at issue is to be proved.

In the syllogism proposed by the Advaitin, to prove the Mithyatva of the world, the world is Paksa. It is with reference to the world that Mithyatva is proposed to be proved. However according to Advaitin himself the world is not true. Therefore, the asraya i.e., that with reference to which Mithyatva is proposed to be proved i.e., the world itself is not available to prove it. This is technically called the fallacy of Asrayasiddhi.

According to the Advaita, the term Mithya means Anirvachaniya i.e., that which cannot be described either as 'sat' or as 'Asat'. However, the possibility of such an entity is yet to be proved. Therefore, the Sadhya i.e., the point to be proved is also known to the parties concerned. This is a fallacy known as Aprasiddhaviseshana.

The nature of the Hetu 'Drisyatva' also cannot be properly explained by the Advaitin. It is not real according to the Advaita. Its Anirvachaniyatva is yet to be established. Therefore, there is the fallacy of Hetu asiddhi also.

२७. दृश्यत्वाभावादसिद्धो हेतुः । अनिर्वचनीयासिद्धेरेव
सपक्षाभावात् विरुद्धः ।
आत्मनोऽपि दृश्यत्वादनैकान्तिकः । (प्र.मि.खं.)

Further there is no instance with reference to which anirvachaniyatva can be demonstrated, because, the concept of Anirvachanitva itself is yet to be established. Because of this, even Suktirajata is Vipaksa. The Hetu i.e., Drisyatva is present in it. Therefore, there is the fallacy of Viruddha also. Since the Hetu Drisyatva is found in Atman also, there is the fallacy of Anaikantika. The fallacies of Kalatyayapadista, prakaranasama etc., are also pointed out.

In this way all the fallacies are pointed out for this syllogism. With a view to enable the students to know the terminology connected with a syllogism the technical terms Paksa, Sapaksa, Vipaksa etc are also explained in this small text. This syllogism is fully examined in Vadavali and Nyayamrta later. The Khandanatraya is the foundation of these great works of Dvaita-Advaita dialectics.

6) TATVODYOTA:

Tatvodyota though stated to be a Prakarana has all the potentiality of a vadagrantha. Its main theme is to point out the difference between the Brahman and the Jivas even at the liberated state and the both the Jiva and the Jagat are completely under the control of the Supreme God and are regulated by him. In the course of developing this theme Sri Madvacharya discusses the nature of the very concept of Bheda i.e., the difference, and the concept of Mithyatva posited in Advaita. He also discusses the import of Sruti. 'Na asat asit na sat' etc, which is interpreted by the Advaitins as lending the support to the concept of sad-asad vilaksanatva. The

२८. प्रत्यक्षविरुद्धत्वात् विश्वं सत्यमित्यादिवाक्य-

विरुद्धत्वाच्च कालात्ययापदिष्टः । (प्र.मि.खं.)

२९. साध्यधर्मविशिष्टः पक्षः । साध्यसमानधर्मविशिष्टः सपक्षः ।

साध्यविरुद्धधर्मविशिष्टः विपक्षः । (प्र.मि.खं.)

३०. विमतः भिन्नः मुक्तत्वात् (त.द्यो.)

Syllogism proposed by the Advaitins to accept the concept of Mithyatva that was briefly reviewed in Prapanchamithyatvanumana-khandana is reviewed here again in greater detail. In that small text Drisyatva hetu was examined. Here two more hetus viz., Jadatva and Parichchinnatva are examined. The concept of Ajnana is refuted. The svaprakasatva concept of Advaita is also examined. The role of Pratyaksa pramana in comprehending the reality is explained and its priority over other pramanas is pointed out. The correct import of the 'Sruti' passages 'tat tvam asi' 'vacharambhanam' etc., is explained.

The most important item discussed in this text is the sameness of the Bhuddhistic position and the Advaita position. It is clearly pointed out that there is no difference between the Sunyavada and Mayavada.

In the very mangala verse the difference between the God and the Jivas, and the fact of God regulating the Jivas and Jada is stated. The text opens with the syllogism 'Vimatah bhinnah muktatvat' stating that the liberated is distinct from Brahman. The question whether this difference is anirvachaniya i.e., indescribable as real or unreal

३१. न च अनिर्वचनीये किञ्चिन्मानम् । अनुमानस्य च-

अप्रसिद्धविशेषणः पक्षः (त.यो.)

३२. 'नासदासीन्नो सदासीद्' इत्यत्र पारिशेष्येण

अनिर्वचनीयत्वाङ्गीकारे 'आनीदवातं स्वधया

तदेकम्' इति परिशिष्टत्वाद् ब्रह्मण एव

अनिर्वचनीयत्वं स्यात् ।

३३. मूर्तं ससिति सम्प्रोक्तममूर्तमसदुच्यते ।

मूर्तामूर्तेतरद् ब्रह्म न सत्तन्नासदुच्यते ॥

इति पैङ्गिश्रुतिः (त.यो.)

or it is real does not arise, because, such a concept as anirvachaniya is not tenable.

The sruti 'Na asad asit no sad asit' etc., does not support the concept of sad-asad-vilaksana. The expression 'sat' in this sruti refers to Murta and 'asad' refers to Amuta. Prithvi etc., are Murta and Vayu and Akasa are Amurta. The Supreme God is different and Supervisor to these. He is described in this Sruti. There is no reference to the Advaita concept of Anirvachaniya here. Brahman is sometimes described as anirvachaniya because he cannot be fully described. Similarly the words Rita-Anrita, Sat-Asat etc, refer to the God and the world respectively with appropriate etymological meaning. The reality of world is mentioned in the sruti passages: 'Visvam satyam Maghavana' Satyah so asya mahima' 'Yathatathyato arthan vyadadhat' etc. The Bhagavadgita condemns those who state the world to be unreal in the verse 'Asatyam apratistham te' etc.

The effort to establish Sada-asad-vilaksanatva by Arthapatti is a failure. The Arthapatti is stated as follows: If Suktirajata were real, it would not have been sublated later, if it were not real it would not have been experienced. Therefore, it is neither real nor unreal. This contention is not acceptable, because, Asat is experienced. It is experienced not as an object of experience but as something

३४. अद्भुतत्वादनिर्वाच्यं ब्रह्म चिच्चेत्यमेव च ।

अचिन्त्यं तत एवैतदतर्क्याङ्गमेव च ।

३५. अ) विश्वं सत्यं मघवाना युवोरिदापश्च न प्रमिनन्ति व्रतं वाम्

आ) सत्यः सोऽस्य महिमा

इ) यथातथ्यतोऽर्थान् व्यदधात् शाश्वतीभ्यः समाभ्यः । (त.यो.)

३६. न च अर्थापत्या अनिर्वचनीयसिद्धिः ।

असतः प्रतीतिं विना असद्वैलक्षण्यानुपपत्तेः । (त.यो.)

referred to in experience. This much reference does not make it something different from the unreal. Therefore, no third category as neither real nor unreal needs to be accepted.

The contention that the world will be sublated soon after one acquires Atmaikyajnana is also not tenable, whether this difference is anirvachaniya i.e., indescribable as real or unreal or it is real does not arise, because, such a concept as anirvachaniya is not tenable.

The sruti 'Na asad asit na sad asit' etc., does not support the concept of sad-asad-vilaksana. The expression 'sat' in this sruti refers to Murta and 'asad' refers to Amuta. Prithvi etc., are Murta and Vayu and Akasa are Amurta. The Supreme God is different and Supervisor to these. He is described in this Sruti. There is no reference to the Advaita concept of Anirvachaniya here. Brahman is sometimes described as anirvachaniya because he cannot be fully described. Similarly the words Rita-Anrita, Sat-Asata etc, refer to the God and the world respectively with appropriate etymological meaning. The reality of world is mentioned in the sruti passages: 'Visvam satyam Maghavana' Satyah so asya mahima' 'Yathatathyato arthan vyadadhat' etc. The Bhagavadgita condemns those who state the world to unreal in the verse 'Asatyam apratistham te' etc.

The effort to establish Sada-asad-vilaksanatva by Arthapatti is a failure. The Arthapatti is stated as follows: If Suktirajata were real, it would not have been sublated later, if it were not real it

would not have been experienced. Therefore, it is neither real nor unreal. This contention is not acceptable, because, Asat is experienced. It is experienced not as an object of experience but as something different from the unreal. Therefore, no third category as neither real nor unreal needs to be accepted.

The contention that the world will be sublated soon after one acquires Atmaikyajnana is also not tenable, because, the very nature of the sublation i.e., badhyatva cannot be explained. The Hetu Drisyatva also is fallacious as it is found in Atman also who is not considered as Mithya. Atman has to be considered as Drisya since his knowledge has to be acquired to get rid of Ajnana. Similarly, the Hetu Jadatva is also fallacious. Jadatva is nothing but pramatritva abhava i.e., not having the knowership. According to the Advaita, Brahman has no Pramatriatva. Therefore, Jadatva will be found in Brahman also who is not supposed to be Mithya. Thus the two Hetus viz. Drisyatva and Jadatva that are given to establish Mithyatva suffer from the fallacy of Anaikantika with reference to the Brahman. The same is the case with reference to the Hetu Parichehinnaatva.

३७. दृश्यत्वाद्यनुमानेष्वपि एते दोषाः ।

आत्मनोऽपि दृश्यत्वादनेकान्तिकता च ।

३८. न च आत्मनः दृक्कर्मत्वं विना

तज्ज्ञानत्वं तदज्ञाननिवृत्तिश्च भवति । (त.द्यो.)

३९. जडत्वं च अप्रमातृत्वमेव । न च प्रमातृत्वमात्मनः-

तैरङ्गीक्रियते । अतः तदपि अनैकान्तिकम् ।

४०. प्रत्यक्षबाधितं च जगन्मिथ्यात्वम् । सदिति प्रतीयमानत्वात् ।

न च प्रत्यक्षसिद्धमन्येन केनापि बाध्यं दृष्टम् । (त.द्यो.)

४१. न च शून्यवादिनः सकाशाद् वैलक्षण्यं मायावादिनः

व्यावहारिकसत्त्वस्य तेनापि अङ्गीक्रियमाणत्वात् ।

अ) सत्यं तु द्विविधं प्रोक्तं सांवृतं पारमार्थिकम् ।

सांवृतं व्यवहार्यं स्यान्निवृत्तौ पारमार्थिकम् ॥

आ) निर्विशेषं स्वयं भातं निर्लेपमजरामरम् ।

शून्यं तत्त्वमविज्ञेयं मनोवाचामगोचरम् ॥ (त.द्यो.)

४२. परास्य शक्तिर्विविधैव श्रूयते

स्वाभाविकी ज्ञानबलक्रिया च (त.द्यो.)

Further, the reality of the world could be ascertained by the perception. The Perception is superior to the inference. Therefore, the Mithyatva which is proposed to be established by the inference has to be rejected.

Finally, it is pointed out that there is no difference between the Sunyavada of the Buddhists and the mayavada of Advaitins. The sameness of the two is pointed out in three important respects by quoting the relevant passages from the Texts of Buddhism and Advaita.

1. The Sunya of Buddhism is described as a) Nirviesa i.e., without any characteristic b) Manovachamagochara not cognisable either by the mind or the words .(c) Svaprakasa i.e. not the object of any knowledge. The Brahman of Advaita also is described in the same way.
2. There are two levels of reality viz., Samvrita satta and Paramarthika satta, according to the Buddhists. According to Advaita also there are two levels Viz., Vyavaharika and paramarthika.
3. The whole world is a projection of Samvrti according to

Buddhists and it is a projection of Avidya according to the Advaita.

From this it is clear that the concepts of Sunya and Brahman are the same and the concepts of Samvrti and Avidya are also the same.

After pointing out the similarity, between Buddhists tenets and the Advaita tenets, the Sruti passages that are quoted to support Advaita are discussed and it is shown that these do not support Advaita. In conclusion it is summed up that Jivas are different from Brahman even at the liberated state and they are regulated by the God even at that stage.

7) VISNUTATTVAVINIRNAYA

Visnutattvavinirnaya is a neatly planned text. The very benedictory verse gives its plan.

The first adjective in the benedictory verse sadagamaikavijneya is elaborated in the first chapter, the second adjective samatitaksraksara in the second chapter, and the adjective nirdosasesasadguna is elaborated in the third chapter.

The Scope Of the Sacred Literature.

The four Vedas, Mahabharata Pancharatra, Mula Ramayana and

४३. प्रत्यक्षानुमानागमविरुद्धत्वात् अभेदविषयवत्
प्रतीयमानानि वाक्यानि सादृश्याद्यर्थान्येव योजनीयानि
विरुद्धवत् प्रतीयन्ते आगमा यत्र वै मिथः ।
तत्र दृष्टानुसारेण तेषामर्थोऽन्ववेक्ष्यते ॥ (त.द्यो.)

४४. सदागमैकविज्ञेयं समतीतक्षराक्षरम् ।
नारायणं सदा वन्दे निर्दोषाशेषसद्गुणम् ॥
विशेषणानि यानीह कथितानि सदुक्तिभिः ।
साधयिष्यामि तान्येव क्रमात् सज्जनसंविदे ॥ (वि.त.नि.)

४५. प्रत्यक्षेणानुमित्या वा यच्च वस्तु न बुद्ध्यते ।
एतद्विदन्ति हि वेदेन तस्माद् वेदस्य वेदता ॥
नेन्द्रियाणि नानुमानं वेदा हि एनं वेदयन्ति तस्मादाहुर्वेदा इति ।

४६. नित्याः वेदाः समस्ताश्च शाश्वताः विष्णुबुद्धिगाः ।
सर्गे सर्गे अमुनैवेते उद्गीर्यन्ते तथैव च ॥
तत्क्रमेणैव तैर्वर्णैः तैः स्वरैरेव नान्यथा ।
अतः श्रुतित्वमेतासां श्रुता एव यतोऽखिलैः ॥ (वि.त.नि.)

such of the Puranas that are not in conflict with the teachings of the Vedas etc., mentioned earlier are sadagama. All other works that follow these also constitute Sadagama. But works that are opposed to the teachings of these such as Pasupata etc., are not Sadagamas. However, even in these works, whatever is in tune with the teachings of the Vedas etc., that is acceptable. This explanation of the scope of Sadagama brings out two important points.

(i) The scope of the sacred literature is not to be confined to the Vedas only but Itihasa Purana are also to be included in it.

(ii) Every work that goes under the name of Agama is not necessarily a sacred work. Its content has to be examined. If it is not opposed to the teachings of the Vedas etc., sacred works, then only, it is a part of sacred literature. Another point that emerges from this definition of the sacred literature is the Vedas should be understood in the light of the Itihasapurana but not in isolation. Veda and Itihasa Purana form a continuous tradition and therefore, these texts have to be interpreted and comprehended in the light of the tradition but not in isolation.

The Doctrines of Veda Apauruseyatva

Vedas constitute the highest sacred literature. This is because, these are apauruseya and Svatah pramana. Therefore, Vishnutattvavinirnaya takes up these two issues for the discussion in the next section.

४७. (अ) सर्वेषां ज्ञानानां यथार्थत्वलक्षणं प्रामाण्यं स्वतः

एव ज्ञानग्राहकेणैव गृह्यते ।

(आ) ज्ञानं साक्षिप्रत्यक्षवेद्यम् । तत्प्रामाण्यमपि
साक्षिप्रत्यक्षवेद्यमेव ।

(इ) ज्ञानग्राहकः साक्षी प्रमाणतयैव गृह्णातीत्युत्सर्ग एव ।

विसंवादलक्षणात् परतः अपवादात् अप्रामाण्यं च गृह्णाति ।

In Indian Philosophy, Veda apauruseyatva is a very important issue. This issue of Veda apauruseyatva is discussed in Jaiminisutras of purvamimamsa in detail and elaborated by sayana in his Veda-bhasyabhumika. This discussion is confined to only three points viz.

(1) Whether a composer of the Vedas, if there was any, could be ascertained in a reasonable way and in the absence of such ascertainment is it not reasonable to conclude that there was no such composer?

(2) If the Vedas were not composed at a given point of time, then, how to account for the references to the names of certain personalities flourished at certain times in tradition and mythology?

(3) What is the role of the sages who are declared to be the seers of Vedic hymns? Are they mere seers or are they composers?

These questions and the answers given to the same do not take us deeper into this problem and do not reveal the deeper insight into the concept of Veda apauruseyatva. Therefore, to understand the deeper implications of the concept of veda apauruseyatva the enquiry has to be made differently. The scope of the enquiry of

४८. (अ) कार्यान्विते एव अर्थे सर्वशब्दानां व्युत्पत्तिदर्शनात्
केवलं सिद्धार्थे तदभावात् न सिद्धस्वरूपे विष्णौ
वेदस्य प्रतिपादकत्वं सम्भवति ।

(आ) वृद्धव्यवहारदर्शनं विना अङ्गुल्यादिनिर्देशेन शब्द-
समुदायस्य कार्यान्वयरहिते एव तस्मिन् अर्थसमुदाये
विषयविषयिभावं तावदवगच्छति बालः ।
एवं कार्यान्वयं विनापि व्युत्पत्तिदर्शनात् योग्येतरा-
न्विते व्युत्पत्तिरिति सामान्यमेव अङ्गीकार्यम् ।

(वि.त.नि.)

both Purvamimamsa and Vedanta is not confined to the external world and its categories. The enquiry into the nature and the role of moral concepts such as Dharma and Adharma, and the spiritual concepts like self, God etc., is the chief task of these two disciplines. The epistemological means like Pratyaksa, Anumana that are sufficient only to comprehend the external world and its categories do not help to comprehend the moral concepts like Dharma and Adharma and the spiritual concepts like self and God. Instructions contained in a work composed by a human being cannot also help us in the matter. Such a human being also has to derive his knowledge from some authentic source. He himself cannot claim to be the source of the knowledge of moral and spiritual concepts. These have to be revealed to the morally and spiritually sensitive minds. Such revelation may be embodied in words and also in other ways. The Vedas constitute such revelations of moral and spiritual concepts as embodied in words i.e., Vedic hymns. This is the basis of the concept of apauruseyatva.

४९. (अ) वाक्यप्रयोगस्य परार्थत्वात् परप्रयोजनाङ्गमेव वाक्यं प्रामाण्यमश्नुते । परप्रयोजनाङ्गं च यत्कार्यपरम् । ततः केवलसिद्धे अर्थे कथं वाक्यस्य प्रामाण्यम्?
- (आ) न च कुत्रचित् सिद्धज्ञापनात् अन्यत् वाक्यप्रयोजनं दृष्टम् । वाक्यं हि प्रमाणम् । तच्च प्रमासाधनम् । प्रमा च यथार्थज्ञानम् । अतः तस्य परज्ञापनमेव प्रयोजनम् । न हि अन्यत् प्रयोजनं दृष्टम् । तच्च प्रयोजनं सिद्ध-विषयमपि अस्ति ।
- (इ) ज्ञात्वैव हि इष्टसाधनतां प्रवर्तते निवर्तते च विपर्ययेण । अतः सिद्ध एव सर्ववाक्यानां प्रामाण्यं सिद्धम् ।
(वि.त.नि.)

The words i.e., Vedic hymns that embody the revelations of spiritual and moral concepts are naturally not composed by anyone.

In Indian tradition varnas are considered as eternal. The words that consists of one or more varnas and the sentences that contain one or more words of the revealed literature are also eternal. The order in which these occur is also not man-made. These are ever present in God's mind and are revealed to the seers. These are handed over by a long tradition of the teacher and the taught.

In view of this, the objections raised taking the human composition i.e., pauruseyavakya as a model do not apply to the revealed literature. The sages referred to as seers of the Vedas are not composers but seers i.e., the recipients of the revelations. Revealed sentences do not need a composer. References made to personalities and events in revealed literature have no temporal restrictions. Therefore, the objections based on these considerations do not hold good in respect of revealed literature which is apauruseya and svatahpramana.

The Doctrine of Pramanya svatastva

The doctrine of pramanyasvatastva mentioned in the context of the Vedas has a much wider scope. Not only the knowledge derived from the Vedas is svatahpramana but all knowledge derived by flawless means of knowledge is svatahpramana. The knowledge derived by nirdusteindriya, nirdustahetu, nirdusta pauruseyashabda is also svatahpramana. The svatahpramanya of knowledge has to be understood in two ways:

५०. भेदस्तावत् धर्मिप्रतियोगिप्रतीतिसापेक्ष इति जीवेश्वरप्रतीत्या अवश्यं भाव्यम् । तत्र यद्यपि जीवः साक्षिप्रत्यक्षसिद्धः तथापि न ईश्वरसिद्धिः । तथा च धर्मिप्रतियोगिप्रतीत्यभावात् कथं तदधीना प्रत्यक्षादिना जीवेश्वरभेदसिद्धिः । (वि.त.नि.टी.)

(i) The knowledge to be true or valid does not require any more additional means than its bonafide means, However these bonafide means must be flawless.

(ii) To know the truth or the validity of knowledge no other additional means is required. Saksin that comprehends knowledge also comprehends its validity. Thus both in Utpatti the origination of knowledge and Jnapti comprehension of knowledge, no additional factors than the respective bonafide means of knowledge are necessary. This is the implication of the concept of svatahpramanya.

So far as apramanya is concerned it arises because of certain defects such as indriyadosa, hetudosa etc. The saksin initially does not comprehend apramanya. It needs the assistance of pariksa. The apramanya is detected by the sublation, contradiction i.e., badha, vyabhichara etc. These indicate apramanya. It is in this sense that apramanya is said to be paratah. However, apramanya is also comprehended by saksin only by these indications. Apauruseya Vedas being absolutely free from these defects are pramana. Pratyaksa etc., are pramana when these are free from the defects. In any case no additional condition or factor is required to validate knowledge. Therefore, all bonafide knowledge is svatahpramana.

These two doctrines viz. veda apauruseyatva and pramanya-svatastva are discussed in Visnutattavinirnaya to support sadagamaikavijneyatva. If sadagama is pramana,, then only sadagamaikavijneyatva is meaningful. Therefore, its pramanya is explained on the grounds of apauruseyatva and svatahpramanya.

५१. प्रत्यक्षानुमानसिद्धत्वे च भेदस्य तद्विरोधादेव अप्रामाण्यं अभेदागमस्य । (वि.त.नि.)

५२. विशेष्यविशेषणतया भेदसिद्धिः । विशेषणविशेष्यभावश्च भेदापेक्षः । धर्मिप्रतियोग्यपेक्षया भेदसिद्धिः । भेदापेक्षं च धर्मि-प्रतियोगित्वमित्यन्योन्याश्रयतया भेदस्य अयुक्तिः । (वि.त.नि.)

The Doctrine of Siddhe Vyutpatti

However, there is one more issue to be tackled in this connection. This issue is the issue of Vyutpatti i.e., sabdabodha or vakyarthabodha. Therefore, this issue is next taken up for discussion.

According to Mimamsakas the sentences communicate only activity and those that are connected with the activity. Visnu is a Siddhavastu. Therefore sadagamas that are of the nature of sentences cannot communicate Visnu or Narayana. This view is known as karye vyutpattivada. This is not tenable. Our day-to-day experience reveals that even siddhavastus that are not connected with any activity are communicated by the sentence. Therefore, there is no difficulty in sadagamas conveying Visnu.

Another point to be noted here is that it is not karyatajnana that is pravartaka but it is istasadhanatajnana that is pravartaka. Therefore, it is not correct to complain that siddhavakyas are not pravartaka and therefore are not pramana.

After settling these two issues, viz., Sadagama is pramana and sadagama is siddhabodhaka the main question whether Visnusarvottamatva and Jivesvarabheda are conveyed by sadagama or abhedha is conveyed, is taken up.

५३. न भेदः धर्मिप्रतियोग्यभयधर्मः । किन्तु धर्मिणः धर्मः प्रतियोगिना निरूप्यः । स च भेदः धर्मिणः स्वरूपमेव । तेन धर्मिप्रतीतिरेव भेदप्रतीतिरिति प्रतीतिद्वयाभावात् न अन्योन्याश्रयता ।

५४. यदि न स्वरूपं भेदः तदा पदार्थे दृष्टे प्रायः सर्वतो वैलक्षण्यं तस्य न ज्ञायेत । सामान्यतः सर्ववैलक्षण्ये ज्ञात एव घटत्वादिज्ञानम् ।

(वि.त.नि.)

The Doctrine of Bheda

In respect of bheda i.e., difference the following points are discussed in visnutattvavinirnaya.

- (1) Whether bhedasrutis are merely anuvadaka or pramana?
- (2) Whether the concept of bheda is tenable or not?
- (3) What is the ontological nature of bheda? Is it Darmisvarupa or Darmibhinna?
- (4) Are the concepts of mithyabheda and aupadhikabheda tenable?
- (5) Is the very concept of mithya tenable?

Advaitins argue that since bheda is known by pratyaksa and anumana, bhedasrutis merely state what is already known. Therefore, these are merely anuvadaka but not pramana in respect of bheda. This argument is not acceptable to Dvaita. To know Jivesvarabheda one has to know both jiva and Isvara. Though the jiva is known by Pratyaksa, Isvara is not known either by Pratyaksa or by Anumana. The Anumana proposed by Nyaya to establish Isvara is also not known before one comes across the Bhedasrutis. Therefore, Bhedasrutis are not anuvadakas but Pramana.

-
५५. (अ) सोऽश्रुते सर्वान् कामान् सह ब्रह्मणा विपश्चिता ।
 (आ) परं ज्योतिरुपसम्पद्य स्वेन रूपेणाभिनिष्पद्यते ।
 (इ) स तत्र पर्येति जक्षन् क्रीडन् रममाणः ।
 (ई) यथोदकं शुद्धे शुद्धमासिक्तं तादृगेव भवति ।
 (उ) निरञ्जनः परमं साम्यमुपैति ।
 (ऊ) ॐ जगद्व्यापारवर्जम् ॐ । (वि.त.नि.)

Further, if bheda is established by Pratyaksa and Anumana, then, abheda sruti that is opposed to this cannot be pramana.

Though ordinarily Sruti is superior to Pratyaksa and Anumana, when these are upajivya to sruti, these are superior. A Pramana that provides the subject is upajivya. In the present context for jivesvara abheda sruti the subject matter, viz., jiva and Isvara are provided by Pratyaksa and Anumana as contended by Advaitin himself. Therefore these are Upajivya to Abheda sruti. Hence, Abheda sruti that is opposed to the bheda established by these cannot be Pramana.

Bheda that is established by Pratyaksa and Anumana, when also stated in bhedasrutis establishes its validity more firmly. Therefore, the mention of bheda in bhedasrutis need not be dubbed as mere anuvada.

The next question is whether the very concept of bheda is tenable. Advaitins argue that bheda i.e., difference could be comprehended either as adjective or as substantive but these very positions depend upon the comprehension of difference. Similarly, the difference is comprehended having a reference to Dharmin i.e., that which is differentiated from something and Pratiyogin that from which it is differentiated. But these two positions depend upon the comprehension of the difference. Thus, comprehension of difference results in anyonyasraya i.e., reciprocal dependency. Hence the concept of difference itself is not tenable.

This objection raised by Advaitins against the concept of difference does not hold good. The ontological nature of the difference is that it is an internal attribute of the object concerned. It is padarthasvarupa that is to say it is dharmisvarupa. When one observes an object, he observes it as distinct from all others in a

-
५६. न च भेदे कश्चिदागमः । सन्ति च भेदे सर्वागमाः । (वि.त.नि.)

general way. Then, he observes it as distinct from this or that object which is referred to in the context. Therefore, there is no question of anyonyasraya i.e., reciprocal dependency.

In case the difference is not considered as an internal attribute of the object, then, when an object is observed its distinction from all other objects would not be observed. However, our experience is, when we see an object we also realise that it is distinct from all other objects also. Therefore, the difference is an internal attribute of the object concerned i.e., padarthasvarupa.

The satyatva of bheda is not only cognised by pratyaksha and anumana but it is affirmed by Sruti more than once. 'Satyam bhida satyam bhida satyam bhida' is the emphatic statement of Sruti. This bheda is five-fold.

The differences-

- i) Between Jiva and Isvara
- ii) Between Jada and Isvara
- iii) Between Jiva and Jiva
- iv) Between Jada and Jiva
- v) Between Jada and Jada

constitute the five-fold differences.

The difference between Jiva and Isvara continues even after liberation. This is made clear in the sruti passages.

From the above exposition of the concept of bheda it is clear that all aspects of the concept of bheda are clearly discussed in

५७. न हि शकुनिसूत्रयोः नानावृक्षरसानां नदीसमुद्रयोः जीववृक्षयोः
अणिमाधानयोः लवणोदकयोः गान्धारपुरुषयोः
अज्ञप्राणादिनियामकयोः स्तेनापहार्ययोः ऐक्यम् । (वि.त.नि.)

Visnutattvavinirnaya. Anuvyakhyana discusses these aspects in greater detail. Bhedojjivana of Sri Vyasa Raja especially discusses this concept. There is no Dvaita work wherein this concept of Bheda is not discussed in some context or the other.

Interpretation of Atat Tvamasi

The most important item discussed in Visnutattvavinirnaya is the interpretation of key sruti passages. This is to show that the entire sruti supports Visnusarvottamatva and Jivesvarabheda but not Jivabrahmaikya.

This statement is illustrated. by showing the correct reading and interpretation of the passage 'Atat tvam asi'. The nine illustrations given in the context speak of jivesvarabheda not jivabrahmaikya..

The context of the teaching of 'Atat tvam asi' is that svetaketu had developed the pride that he knew everything. He was to be told that he did not know the highest entity i.e., the Supreme God as distinct and superior to him. He also did not know that he was under the control of this Supreme God. In this context no useful purpose would be served if he was told that he is identical with the God. This would increase his pride. Therefore, he was told 'Atat tvam asi' you are not the God. You are completely under his control.

Therefore, it is jivesvarabheda that is intended to be conveyed here.

५८. सर्वान् वेदानधीत्य महामनाः अनूचानमानी स्तब्ध एयाय इति
आत्मनः अन्यं अनूचानत्वादिगुणप्रदं परमविज्ञाय स्तब्धस्य
पराधीनत्वज्ञापनेन स्तब्धतां निरस्य तन्निष्ठा हि अत्रोपदिश्यते ।
एकविज्ञानेन सर्वविज्ञानं च प्राधान्यात् किञ्चित् सादृश्यात् । न तु
तदन्यस्य मिथ्यात्वात् । न हि सत्यज्ञानेन मिथ्याज्ञानं भवति ।
(वि.त.नि.टी.)

Ekavijnanena sarvavijnana stated in this context does not indicate upadanopadeyabhava here but is based on pradhanya and sadrsya. Therefore, this does not convey jaganmithyatva.

The illustrations of mrtpinda, lohamani and nakhanikrntana indicate ekavijnanena sarvavijnana on the ground of sadrsya but not on the ground of tadatmya or Abhedha. The vacharambhana illustrations also indicate pradhanajnana apradhanajnana. Therefore, these also do not speak of jivesvaraikya and jaganmithyatva.

Interpretation of 'Aham Bramhasmi' etc., Sruti

The sruti passages 'aham brahasmi' 'yosau so aham' 'so aham asmi' etc. speak about antaryamitva but not about Aikya i.e., abhedha. In fact 'aham' 'tvam' 'sah' etc., are the names of the Supreme God and speak of him.

Therefore, these srutis also do not support jivesvaraikya.

The Srutis that are supposed to support Abhedha also do not support it.

- (1) Pare avyaye sarve ekibhavanti

Here ekibhava does not mean abhedha but it means matyaikya and sthanaikya.

- (2) He who knows Brahman will attain the greatness. This passage does not mean that he will attain identity with Brahman.

५९. अहं नामा हरिर्नित्यमहेयत्वात् प्रकीर्तितः ।

त्वं चासौ प्रतियोगित्वात् परोक्षत्वात् स इत्यपि ।

सर्वान्तर्यामिणि हरौ अस्मच्छब्दविभक्तयः ।

युष्मच्छब्दगताश्चैव सर्वाः तस्मच्छब्दगा अपि ।

सर्वशब्दगताश्चैव वचनान्यखिलान्यपि ।

स्वतन्त्रत्वात् प्रवर्तन्ते व्यावृत्तेऽप्यखिलात् सदा ॥ (वि.त.नि.)

- (3) The sruti prapancho yadi vidyeta etc., does not support jaganmithyatva but explains the five-fold differences.
- (4) The sruti na pretya sanjnasti does not mean 'after liberation only nirvisesachinmatra remains' but it means the liberated will not have vrttijnana and the unliberated will not have the knowledge of the liberated.
- (5) The sruti 'na tu tad dvitiam asti' does not mean that there is no second entity but it only means that the different forms of the God are not different from each other.
- (6) The 'Sruti' yatra tu asya sarvamatmaivabhut tat kena kam pasyet' does not state that 'the liberated will not see, will not hear' etc., and attains nirvisesachinmatra state. It is not a statement of the position in the liberated state. But it is prasanga apadana. That is to say, it points out certain adverse consequences if the liberated state is described as nirvisesachinmatra state.

From the above discussion of the correct meaning of Srutis it is clear that no Sruti supports Jivesvara abhedha or Jaganmithyatva.

The Doctrine of Jagat Satyatva

Visnutattvavinirnaya re-enforces the concept of Jagat satyatva by quoting a number of sruti passages.

६०. जीवस्य परमैक्यं तु बुद्धिसारूप्यमेव तु ।

एकस्थाननिवासो वा व्यक्तिस्थानमपेक्ष्य सः ॥

६१. प्रकृष्टः पञ्चविधः भेदः प्रपञ्चः । माया भगवत्प्रज्ञा सैव मानत्राणकर्त्री यस्य तन्मायामात्रम् । परमेश्वरेण ज्ञातत्वात् रक्षितत्वाच्च न द्वैतं भ्रान्तिकल्पितं परमार्थापेक्षया अद्वैतः सर्वस्मादुत्तमः सः एकः एव ।

The Doctrine of Visnusarvottamatva

The central theme of Visnutattvavinirnaya is to proclaim the supremacy of lord Visnu. All other issues are only preparatory to the presentation of this final doctrine. This central doctrine is emphasised more than once in this text. Several srutis and itihasa-Purana passages are quoted to bring home this doctrine.

These passages bring out the following special characteristics of Lord Visnu.

(1) He is superior to both Ksara and Aksara. Aksara refers to Goddess Laksmi and Ksara refers to all other beings. God Visnu is superior to these. He is Purusottama the Supreme.

(2) He is conveyed by the entire sacred scriptures. His glory is the chief purport of the scriptures.

६२. यदि विविशेषचैतन्यमात्रमवशिष्यते न किमपि वस्तु इति मतं स्यात् तदा दर्शनघ्राणादिभोगोऽस्य न स्यात् । भवितव्यं च दर्शनादिभोगेन । अतः निर्विशेषचैतन्यमात्रावस्थानलक्षणः मोक्षः अनुपपन्नः इत्यापादनात्मकः आक्षेपः एव अस्य वाक्यस्यार्थः । (वि.त.नि.टी.)

६३. (अ) कविर्मनिषी परिभूः स्वयम्भूः ।
याथातथ्यतोऽर्थान् व्यदधात् शाश्वतीभ्यः समाभ्यः ।
(आ) यच्चिकेत सत्यमिह तन्न मोघम् ।
(इ) विश्वं सत्यं मघवाना युवोदिदापश्च न प्रमिनन्ति व्रतं वाम् ।
(ई) अनाद्यनन्तं जगदेतदीदृक् प्रवर्तते नात्र विचार्यमस्ति ।
(वि.त.नि.)

(3) At the commencement of the creation, he alone existed and all others were created by him.

(4) All names convey him only.

(5) He is independent, One and Supreme.

(6) He creates, sustains, destroys, regulates, gives knowledge, conceals, binds and liberates. All these flow from The Supreme Lord Hari.

(7) He gives knowledge, liberation and bliss. He binds and he liberates.

(8) He is absolutely free from the drawbacks and inadequacies. He is independent and all others are entirely dependent on him.

(9) All his attributes and actions are not distinct from him.

(10) He cannot be obtained by mere discourses, by mere learning or intellect. Whomsoever the God chooses; he can obtain him. God reveals his nature to him. He who knows Lord Visnu as possessed

५४. (अ) द्वाविमौ पुरुषौ लोके क्षरश्चाक्षर एव च ।
क्षरः सर्वाणि भूतानि कूटस्थोऽक्षर उच्यते ॥
उत्तमः पुरुषस्त्वन्यः परमात्मेत्युदाहृतः ।
यो लोकत्रयमाविश्य बिभर्त्यव्यय ईश्वरः ॥
यस्मात् क्षरमतीतोऽहमक्षरादपि चोत्तमः ।
अतोऽस्मि लोके वेदे च प्रथितः पुरुषोत्तमः ॥ (गीता)
(आ) सर्वोत्कर्षे देवदेवस्य विष्णोः
महातात्पर्यं नैव चान्यत्र सत्यम् ।
अवान्तरं तत्परत्वं तदन्यत्
सर्वागमानां पुरुषार्थः ततोऽतः ॥ इति पैङ्गिश्रुतिः ।

of infinite attributes gets rid of the bondage and enjoys the bliss in God's presence.

These are only a few passages that bring out the glory of Lord Visnu. The main features of the Dvaita concept of Visnu the Supreme God are: (i) He is svatantra (ii) He is gunapurna (iii) He is nirdosa. (iv) He is sarvakarta and (v) He is sarvottama.

These features are amply brought out in visnutattvavinirnaya.

8) KARMANIRNAYA

The purpose of this text is to explain the philosophical meaning of Rgveda. For this purpose Mahanamni hymns are selected. These hymns are called Mahanamni, because, the names of Indra etc.,

- (इ) मुख्यं च सर्ववेदानां तात्पर्यं श्रीपतेः परम् ।
उत्कर्षे तु तदन्यत्र तात्पर्यं स्यादवान्तरम् ।
इति महावाराहे ।
- (ई) ब्रह्मा शिवः सुराद्याश्च शरीररक्षणात् क्षराः ।
लक्ष्मीरक्षरदेहत्वादक्षरा तत्परो हरिः ॥
स्वातन्त्र्यशक्तिविज्ञानसुखाद्यैरखिलैः गुणैः ।
निस्सीमत्वेन ते सर्वे तद्वशाः सर्वदैव च ॥
- (उ) एको नारायण आसीत् न ब्रह्मा नेशानो नाग्नीषोमौ
नेमे द्यावा पृथिवी ।
- (ऊ) नामानि सर्वाणि यमाविशन्ति
तं वै विष्णुं परममुदाहरन्ति ॥
अस्यैव सर्वनामानि व्यतिरिक्तस्य सर्वतः ।
यः स्वतन्त्रः सदैवैकः स विष्णुः परमो मतः ।
(वि.त.नि.)

occurring in these hymns are really the names of the Great God Visnu. In fact every word, every mantra, and every sukta conveys Him only. All sacrifices are meant for Him only. The Chaturmukha Brahma, Rudra etc., gods perform the sacrifices for Him only. This is made clear in the very mangala verse of this work.

Visnu is called Mahat i.e., the Great: because, he has infinite number of qualities. This is contested in Advaita which considers him as Nirguna. Therefore, his gunapurnatva is established by quoting the relevant sruti passages. Then the question 'How can the God be conveyed by the Veda, because, vedas communicate something that is to be acted upon' is raised. It is claimed that all sentences communicate Karya only.

This question is answered by pointing out that even Siddhavastu

६५. य इज्यते विधीशानशक्रपूर्वैः सदा मखैः ।
रमाप्रणयिने तस्मै सर्वयज्ञभुजे नमः ॥ (क.नि.)
६६. महन्नाम यासु ऋक्षु विद्यते ता महानाम्न्यः ।
परस्य ब्रह्माणो यन्नाम इन्द्रादिकं तन्महार्थत्वात् महत् । (क.नि.)
६७. तत्रैके आहुः अगुणं ब्रह्मेति । न तद् युक्तम् ।
श्रुतियुक्तिविरोधात् । (क.नि.)
६८. न च सिद्धेऽर्थे वाक्यस्य प्रामाण्याभावात्
ईश्वराद्यसिद्धिः । सिद्धातिरिक्तकार्याभावात् ।
लिङ्गाद्यर्थस्तु इष्टसाधनत्वमेव । न हि
कर्तव्यत्वं नाम इष्टसाधनत्वादन्यत् किञ्चित्
अतः सिद्धेऽर्थे प्रामाण्यसिद्धेश्च
सिद्धं महागुणवत्त्वं विष्णोः । (क.नि.)

is conveyed by the sentences and therefore, there is no difficulty to convey Visnu by the veda.

After the Above Preliminary observations, the Mahanamni hymns are interpreted word by word. The import of the very first hymn is explained as under: 'O, Lord of the Sacrifice! give us the knowledge to praise you, teach us the import of the traditionally handed down hymns. You are the lord of the speech and you are the lord of the knowledge.

While giving the above import the passages from other hymns are profusely quoted in support of the meaning given. For instance, to support the meaning given to the word Maghavan, as many as seven occurrences of the word Magha and Maghavan in Rgveda are given. The method of fixing the meaning of a word in Rgveda by examining its occurrences in other places of Rgveda in different

६९. यत्र वाचनिकार्थादन्यः तात्पर्यार्थः प्रतीयते लौकिकवाक्येषु न तत्र साक्षाद् वचनं प्रबोधकम् । वचनलिङ्गकानुमा हि सा । विरोधादमुख्यवृत्तिर्वा आप्तत्वनिश्चये । आप्तत्वनिश्चये प्रमाणमेव न भवति । वेदवाक्यस्य तु वाचनिकार्थं विना नैवान्यो युज्यते । वाचनिकानां तु बहूनामपि अविरोधे स्वीकार्यता । (क.नि.)

७०. अ) रूढियोगौ विना कश्चित् नैवार्थो वेदगो भवेत् ।
तत्रापि यौगिको मुख्यः सर्वत्रास्ति स वैदिके ।
अनवस्था निवृत्त्यर्थं यौगिके रूढकल्पना ।
आ) मुख्यार्थानां च सर्वेषां तारतम्यं च विद्यते
तत्रापि परमो मुख्यो वाच्योऽशेषरवैः हरिः ॥ (क.नि.)
७१. भगवद्भक्तिज्ञानपूर्वकं च कर्म कर्तव्यम् । (क.नि.)

contexts is supposed to be a modern method. However, Sri Madhvacharya had employed this method seven hundred years before in his Rgbhasya and Karmanirnaya. Ancient laxicons like sabdatatva are also quoted.

Another interesting question raised while interpreting these hymns is the relative position of Vachanika artha and tatparya artha. So far as the Vedas are concerned, there is no Tatparyartha. It is always vachanikartha. Even the Arthavadas have Vachanika artha. In Pouruseya statements, the Vachanikartha helps to infer the tatparyartha. Its validity depends upon the reliability of the speaker.

Another interesting point that is stated: All Vedic words are Yaugika words. When a word is stated as Rudha, it only indicates Yoga-visranti i.e., stopping of the discovery of further yoga.

There are many levels of Mukhyarthas. The Supreme God is Paramamukhyartha of every word.

All sacrifices and rituals should be performed with the devotion to the God and the detachment from worldly results. All sacrifices be offered at the feet of the God.

9) PRAMANALAKSANA

This is a work of Epistemology. In this work the nature and the number of Pramanas are discussed. The work begins with a definition of Pramana as 'Yathartham Pramanam'. This covers both the knowledge and the means of knowledge. The knowledge is

७२. यथार्थं प्रमाणम् । तद् द्विविधं केवलमनुप्रमाणं च ।
यथार्थज्ञानं केवलम् । तत्साधनमनुप्रमाणम् । (प्र.ल.)
७३. निर्दोषेन्द्रियार्थसन्निकर्षः प्रत्यक्षम् । निर्दोषोपपत्तिरनुमानम् ।
निर्दोषः शब्दः आगमः । अर्थापत्त्युपमे अनुमाविशेषः ।
अभावोऽनुमा प्रत्यक्षं वा । (प्र.ल.)

Kevalapramana while the means of the knowledge are Anupramana. The word Pramana admits both the meanings viz., the knowledge and its means. The knowledge is called Kevala-pramana while means of the knowledge are called Anupramana. The kevala-pramana is further classified as Isvarajnana, Laksmijnana etc.

Anupramana is classified as Pratyaksa, Anumana and Agama. Arthapatti and Upamana are brought under Anumana only. Sambhava and Parisesa are also brought under Anumana. Upakrama etc., are a form of arguments. Samakhya, vakya, prakarana etc. are also the same.

The contact between the senses and the objects that is free from the defects is Pratyaksa. The arguments free from the defects are Anumana. The verbal communication free from the defects is Sabdapramana. Vyapti i.e., invariable association is the ground of the argument. Conflict and incogruity are the defects of the

७४. उपक्रमोपसंहारतदैकरूप्याभ्यासापूर्वताफलार्थवादाश्च

उपपत्तिविशेषाः । समाख्यावाक्यप्रकरणस्थानानि च
लिङ्गविशेषाः । (प्र.ल.)

७५. सर्वे एते दृश्यत्वानुमाने द्रष्टव्याः । (प्र.ल.)

७६. आनन्दतीर्थमुनिना ब्रह्मतर्कोक्तमार्गतः ।

मानलक्षणमित्युक्तं सङ्केपाद् ब्रह्मसिद्धये ॥ (प्र.ल.)

७७. वादो जल्पो वितण्डेति त्रिविधा विदुषां कथा । (क.ल.)

७८. अ) तत्त्वनिर्णयमुद्दिश्य केवलं गुरुशिष्ययोः ।
कथाऽन्येषामपि सतां वादो वा समितेः शुभा ।
आ) ख्यात्याद्यर्थं स्पर्धया वा सतां जल्प इतीर्यते ।

arguments. These details are fully explained in the commentaries. The details of Nigrahasthana, Jati etc., are also explained.

All the fallacies and the other defects listed above are shown in the syllogism proposed by Advaita to posit Mithyatva.

The definitions of Pramana given by Prabhakaras and Bhattas are rejected. Smriti is declared to be Pramana.

At the close of the text it is stated that the Pramana laksana and the other details given here are drawn from Brahmatarka.

10) KATHALAKSANAM

The Philosophical debate is called Katha. Certain guidelines and rules are laid down for philosophical debate in Indian tradition. These are given in this text.

The Philosophical debate is classified in three categories viz., vada, Jalpa and Vitanda.

i) When the teacher and the pupil or any two friendly scholars conduct a debate in order to discover the truth or to show the truth more clearly and precisely, it is called vada.

ii) When two scholars enter into a debate to obtain the fame as a scholar or envying each other's scholarship, then, it is called Jalpa.

iii) When one of the scholar has an intention to conceal or to reject

७९. रागद्वेषविहीनास्तु सर्वविद्याविशारदाः

प्राश्रिका इति विज्ञेयाः विषमाः

एक एव वा

अशेषसंशयच्छेत्ता निःसंशय उदारधीः ।

एको वा बहवो वा स्युः विष्णुभक्तिपराः सदा । (क.ल.)

the truth and enters into an argument with such intentions, then it is called vitanda.

For a philosophical debate apart from the two contenders, one or more Prasnikas i.e., referees are necessary. These must be impartial, should be able to remove the doubts, free from the malice, and god-minded.

An important requirement of a philosophical debate in Vedanta is, one has to quote from the scripture to establish his point. The other party also should establish his contention by interpreting the scripture to support his contention. The arguments should be used only to determine the meaning of the scripture one way or the other.

In the case of Vada, the inability to determine the truth itself, is defeat. In Jalpa one who is silenced in the debate has to be blamed or fined. The same is the case in Vitanda also.

These details of the philosophical debate are also derived from Brahmatarka.

From the above summary it is clear that all important doctrines of Dvaita Vedanta are briefly touched in Dasaprakaranas. Important Sruti passages are also interpreted. A study of these will naturally provide a good foundation for the advanced study of Dvaita Vedanta.

Prof. K.T. Pandurangi

Upakulapathi, Poornaprajna Vidyapeetha

-
८०. अ) तत्त्वनिर्णयवैलोम्यं साक्षात् वादे पराजयः ।
 आ) विरोधासङ्गतिन्यूनतूष्णीम्भावादिकैर्जितः भवेत् जल्पे ।
 इ) वितण्डायां न्यायो जल्पवदीरितः ।